

02-24-00

A

jc715 U.S. PTO
02/22/00

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Robert Moore
Filed : Herewith
For : IMPROVED LEFT-CORNER CHART
PARSING SYSTEM
Docket No.: M61.12-0308

jc542 U.S. PTO
09/510020
02/22/00

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

"Express Mail" mailing label number: **EL418984615US**
Date of Deposit: **February 22, 2000**

The following paper(s) and/or fee(s) are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee", addressed to Box Provisional Patent Application, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231:

1. Application Cover Sheet (in duplicate)
2. Patent Application comprising the following pages:
 - 1 Abstract
 - 44 Specification
 - 23 Claims
 - 7 Sheets of drawings

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By:

Joseph R. Kelly
Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg

Express Mail No. EL418984615US

PATENT APPLICATION OF

ROBERT C. MOORE

ENTITLED

IMPROVED LEFT-CORNER CHART PARSING SYSTEM

Docket No. M61.12-0308

IMPROVED LEFT-CORNER CHART PARSING SYSTEM

REFERENCE TO CO-PENDING APPLICATION

5 Reference is hereby made to co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/441,685, entitled ELIMINATION OF LEFT RECURSION FROM CONTEXT-FREE GRAMMARS, filed on November 16, 1999.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

10 The present invention deals with parsing text. More specifically, the present invention deals with improvements in left-corner chart parsing.

 Parsing refers to the process of analyzing a
15 text string into its component parts and categorizing those parts. This can be part of processing either artificial languages (C++, Java, HTML, XML, etc.) or natural languages (English, French, Japanese, etc.). For example, parsing the English sentence, *the man with the umbrella opened the large wooden door*, would
20 normally involve recognizing that:

- *opened* is the main verb of the sentence,
- 25 • the subject of *opened* is the noun phrase *the man with the umbrella*,
- the object of *opened* is the noun phrase *the large wooden door*,
- 30 with *the man with the umbrella* and *the large wooden door* being further analyzed into their component parts. The fact that parsing is nontrivial is

illustrated by the fact that the sentence contains the substring *the umbrella opened*, which in isolation could be a full sentence, but in this case is not even a complete phrase of the larger sentence.

5

Parsing by computer is sometimes performed by a program that is specific to a particular language, but often a general-purpose parsing algorithm is used with a formal grammar for a specific language to
10 parse strings in that language. That is, rather than having separate programs for parsing English and French, a single program is used to parse both languages, but it is supplied with a grammar of English to parse English text, and a grammar of
15 French to parse French text.

Perhaps the most fundamental type of formal grammar is context-free grammar. A context-free grammar consists of terminal symbols, which are the
20 tokens of the language; a set of nonterminal symbols, which are analyzed into sequences of terminals and other nonterminals; a set of productions, which specify the analyses; and a distinguished "top" nonterminal symbol, which specifies the strings that
25 can stand alone as complete expressions of the language.

The productions of a context-free grammar can be expressed in the form $A \rightarrow X_1 . . . X_n$ where A is a

single nonterminal symbol, and $X_1 . . . X_n$ is a sequence of n terminals and/or nonterminals. The interpretation of a production $A \rightarrow X_1 . . . X_n$ is that a string can be categorized by the nonterminal A if
5 it consists of a sequence of contiguous substrings that can be categorized by $X_1 . . . X_n$.

The goal of parsing is to find an analysis of a string of text as an instance of the top symbol of
10 the grammar, according to the productions of the grammar. To illustrate, suppose we have the following grammar for a tiny fragment of English:

$S \rightarrow NP VP$
15 $NP \rightarrow Name$
 $Name \rightarrow john$
 $Name \rightarrow mary$
 $VP \rightarrow V NP$
 $V \rightarrow likes$

20

In this grammar, terminals are all lower case, nonterminals begin with an upper case letter, and S is the distinguished top symbol of the grammar. The productions can be read as saying that a sentence can
25 consist of a noun phrase followed by a verb phrase, a noun phrase can consist of a name, *john* and *mary* can be names, a verb phrase can consist of a verb followed by a noun phrase, and *likes* can be a verb.

It should be easy to see that the string *john likes mary* can be analyzed as a complete sentence of the language defined by this grammar according the following structure:

5

```
(S: (NP: (Name: john))
    (VP: (V: likes)
         (NP: (Name: mary))))
```

10 For parsing natural language, often grammar formalisms are used that augment context-free grammar in some way, such as adding features to the nonterminal symbols of the grammar, and providing a mechanism to propagate and test the values of the

15 features. For example, the nonterminals *NP* and *VP* might be given the feature *number*, which can be tested to make sure that singular subjects go with singular verbs and plural subjects go with plural verbs. Nevertheless, even natural-language parsers

20 that use one of these more complex grammar formalisms are usually based on some extension of one of the well-known algorithms for parsing with context-free grammars.

25 Grammars for artificial languages, such as programming languages (C++, Java, etc.) or text mark-up languages (HTML, XML, etc.) are usually designed so that they can be parsed deterministically. That is, they are designed so that the grammatical

structure of an expression can be built up one token
at a time without ever having to guess how things fit
together. This means that parsing can be performed
very fast and is rarely a significant performance
5 issue in processing these languages.

Natural languages, on the other hand, cannot be
parsed deterministically, because it is often
necessary to look far ahead before it can be
10 determined how an earlier phrase is to be analyzed.
Consider for example the two sentences:

Visiting relatives often stay too long.

15 *Visiting relatives often requires a long trip.*

In the first sentence, *visiting relatives* refers
to relatives who visit, while in the second sentence
it refers to the act of paying a visit to relatives.
20 In any reasonable grammar for English, these two
instances of *visiting relatives* would receive
different grammatical analyses. The earliest point in
the sentences where this can be determined, however,
is after the word *often*. It is hard to imagine a way
25 to parse these sentences, such that the correct
analysis could be assigned with certainty to *visiting
relatives* before it is combined with the analysis of
the rest of the sentence.

The existence of nondeterminacy in parsing natural languages means that sometimes hundreds, or even thousands, of hypotheses about the analyses of parts of a sentence must be considered before a
5 complete parse of the entire sentence is found. Moreover, many sentences are grammatically ambiguous, having multiple parses that require additional information to chose between. In this case, it is desirable to be able to find all parses of a
10 sentence, so that additional knowledge sources can be used later to make the final selection of the correct parse. The high degree of nondeterminacy and ambiguity in natural languages means that parsing natural language is computationally expensive, and as
15 grammars are made more detailed in order to describe the structure of natural-language expressions more accurately, the complexity of parsing with those grammars increases. Thus in almost every application of natural-language processing, the computation time
20 needed for parsing is a serious issue, and faster parsing algorithms are always desirable to improve performance.

"Chart parsing" or "tabular parsing" refers to a
25 broad class of efficient parsing algorithms that build a collection of data structures representing segments of the input partially or completely analyzed as a phrase of some category in the grammar. These data structures are individually referred to as

"edges" and the collection of edges derived in parsing a particular string is referred to as a "chart". In these algorithms, efficient parsing is achieved by the use of dynamic programming, which simply means that if the same chart edge is derived in more than one way, only one copy is retained for further processing.

The present invention is directed to a set of improvements to a particular family of chart parsing algorithms referred to as "left-corner" chart parsing. Left-corner parsing algorithms are distinguished by the fact that an instance of a given production is hypothesized when an instance of the left-most symbol on the right-hand side of the production has been recognized. This symbol is sometimes called the "left corner" of the production; hence, the name of the approach. For example, if $VP \rightarrow V NP$ is a production in the grammar, and a terminal symbol of category V has been found in the input, then a left-corner parsing algorithm would consider the possibility that the V in the input should combine with a NP to its right to form a VP .

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Different embodiments of the present invention provide improvements to left-corner chart parsing. The improvements include a specific order of filtering checks, transforming the grammar using

bottom-up prefix merging, indexing productions first based on input symbols, grammar flattening, and annotating chart edges for the extraction of parses.

5

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

FIG. 1 is a block diagram of an exemplary environment in which the present invention can be implemented.

10

FIG. 2 is a block diagram of a left-corner chart parser.

15

FIGS. 3A-3C are flow diagrams illustrating the performance of a bottom-up left-corner check and a top-down left-corner check in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.

20

FIGS. 4 and 5 are flow diagrams illustrating a bottom-up prefix merging transformation in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.

25

FIGS. 6A and 6B illustrate a data structure used in indexing productions and a method of using that data structure.

FIGS. 7A and 7B illustrate a data structure used in indexing productions and a method of using that data structure in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.

FIGs. 8 and 9 illustrate grammar flattening.

FIGs. 10 and 11 illustrate methods of performing grammar flattening in accordance with embodiments of the present invention.

FIG. 12A is a data structure used in annotating chart edges in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.

FIG. 12B illustrates a trace-back of chart edges to obtain an analysis of an input text in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.

FIGs. 13, 14A and 14B illustrate the trace-back of chart edges, using annotations on those edges, in accordance with another embodiment of the present invention.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE ILLUSTRATIVE EMBODIMENTS

OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENT

The discussion of FIG. 1 below is simply to set out but one illustrative environment in which the present invention can be used, although it can be used in other environments as well.

FIG. 1 is a block diagram of a computer 20 in accordance with one illustrative embodiment of the present invention. FIG. 1 and the related discussion

are intended to provide a brief, general description of a suitable computing environment in which the invention may be implemented. Although not required, the invention will be described, at least in part, in the
5 general context of computer-executable instructions, such as program modules, being executed by a personal computer. Generally, program modules include routine programs, objects, components, data structures, etc. that perform particular tasks or implement particular
10 abstract data types. Moreover, those skilled in the art will appreciate that the invention may be practiced with other computer system configurations, including hand-held devices, multiprocessor systems, microprocessor-based or programmable consumer
15 electronics, network PCs, minicomputers, mainframe computers, and the like. The invention may also be practiced in distributed computing environments where tasks are performed by remote processing devices that are linked through a communications network. In a
20 distributed computing environment, program modules may be located in both local and remote memory storage devices.

In FIG. 1, an exemplary system for implementing
25 the invention includes a general purpose computing device in the form of a conventional personal computer 20, including processing unit 21, a system memory 22, and a system bus 23 that couples various system components including the system memory to the

processing unit 21. The system bus 23 may be any of several types of bus structures including a memory bus or memory controller, a peripheral bus, and a local bus using any of a variety of bus architectures. The
5 system memory includes read only memory (ROM) 24 a random access memory (RAM) 25. A basic input/output 26 (BIOS), containing the basic routine that helps to transfer information between elements within the personal computer 20, such as during start-up, is
10 stored in ROM 24. The personal computer 20 further includes a hard disk drive 27 for reading from and writing to a hard disk (not shown), a magnetic disk drive 28 for reading from or writing to removable magnetic disk 29, and an optical disk drive 30 for
15 reading from or writing to a removable optical disk 31 such as a CD ROM or other optical media. The hard disk drive 27, magnetic disk drive 28, and optical disk drive 30 are connected to the system bus 23 by a hard disk drive interface 32, magnetic disk drive interface
20 33, and an optical drive interface 34, respectively. The drives and the associated computer-readable media provide nonvolatile storage of computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules and other data for the personal computer 20.

25

Although the exemplary environment described herein employs a hard disk, a removable magnetic disk 29 and a removable optical disk 31, it should be appreciated by those skilled in the art that other

types of computer readable media that can store data that is accessible by a computer, such as magnetic cassettes, flash memory cards, digital video disks, Bernoulli cartridges, random access memories (RAMs),
5 read only memory (ROM), and the like, may also be used in the exemplary operating environment.

A number of program modules may be stored on the hard disk, magnetic disk 29, optical disk 31, ROM 24 or
10 RAM 25, including an operating system 35, one or more application programs 36, other program modules 37, and program data 38. A user may enter commands and information into the personal computer 20 through input devices such as a keyboard 40 and pointing device 42.
15 Other input devices (not shown) may include a microphone, joystick, game pad, satellite dish, scanner, or the like. These and other input devices are often connected to the processing unit 21 through a serial port interface 45 that is coupled to the system
20 bus 23, but may be connected by other interfaces, such as a sound card, a parallel port, a game port or a universal serial bus (USB). A monitor 47 or other type of display device is also connected to the system bus 23 via an interface, such as a video adapter 48. In
25 addition to the monitor 47, personal computers may typically include other peripheral output devices such as a speaker and printers (not shown).

The personal computer 20 may operate in a

networked environment using logic connections to one or more remote computers, such as a remote computer 49. The remote computer 49 may be another personal computer, a server, a router, a network PC, a peer device or other network node, and typically includes many or all of the elements described above relative to the personal computer 20, although only a memory storage device 50 has been illustrated in FIG. 1. The logic connections depicted in FIG. 1 include a local are network (LAN) 51 and a wide area network (WAN) 52. Such networking environments are commonplace in offices, enterprise-wide computer network intranets and the Internet.

When used in a LAN networking environment, the personal computer 20 is connected to the local area network 51 through a network interface or adapter 53. When used in a WAN networking environment, the personal computer 20 typically includes a modem 54 or other means for establishing communications over the wide area network 52, such as the Internet. The modem 54, which may be internal or external, is connected to the system bus 23 via the serial port interface 46. In a network environment, program modules depicted relative to the personal computer 20, or portions thereof, may be stored in the remote memory storage devices. It will be appreciated that the network connections shown are exemplary and other means of establishing a communications link between the computers may be used.

OVERVIEW OF PARSING NOTATION AND RULES

FIG. 2 is a simplified block diagram of a left-corner chart parser. FIG. 2 illustrates that left-corner chart parser 150 receives an input text string and provides at its output an analysis of the input text string. An exemplary input text string, and an exemplary analysis, are discussed below in greater detail. FIG. 2 also illustrates that, part of left-corner chart parser 150 includes a left-corner index table 152 which is used generating a chart, as is also described in greater detail below.

In the notation that follows, nonterminals, which will sometimes be referred to as categories, will be designated by "low order" upper-case letters (A, B, etc.); and terminals will be designated by lower-case letters. The notation a_i indicates the i th terminal symbol in the input string. "High order" upper-case letters (X, Y, Z) denote single symbols that could be either terminals or nonterminals, and Greek letters denote (possibly empty) sequences of terminals and/or nonterminals. For a grammar production $A \rightarrow B_1 \dots B_n$ we will refer to A as the mother of the production and to $B_1 \dots B_n$ as the daughters of the production. The nonterminal symbol S is used as the top symbol of the grammar, which subsumes all sentences allowed by the grammar.

The term "item", as used herein, means an instance of a grammar production with a "dot" somewhere on the right-hand side to indicate how many of the daughters have been recognized in the input, e.g., $A \rightarrow B_1.B_2$. An "incomplete item" is an item with at least one daughter to the right of the dot, indicating that at least one more daughter remains to be recognized before the entire production is matched; and a "complete item" is an item with no daughters to the right of the dot, indicating that the entire production has been matched.

The terms "incomplete edge" or "complete edge" mean an incomplete item or complete item, plus two input positions indicating the segment of the input covered by the daughters that have already been recognized. These will be written as (e.g.) $\langle A \rightarrow B_1B_2.B_3, i, j \rangle$, which means that the sequence B_1B_2 has been recognized starting at position i and ending at position j , and has been hypothesized as part of a longer sequence ending in B_3 , which is classified a phrase of category A . The symbol immediately following the dot in an incomplete edge is often of particular interest. These symbols are referred to as "predictions". Positions in the input will be numbered starting at 0, so the i th terminal of an input string spans position $i-1$ to i . Items and edges, none of whose daughters have yet been recognized, are referred to as "initial".

Left-corner (LC) parsing depends on the left-corner relation for the grammar, where X is recursively defined to be a left corner of A if $X =$
 5 A , or the grammar contains a production of the form $B \rightarrow X\alpha$, where B is a left corner of A . This relation is normally precompiled and indexed so that any pair of symbols can be checked in essentially constant time.

10

A chart-based LC parsing algorithm can be defined by the following set of rules for populating the chart:

15

1. For every grammar production with S as its mother, $S \rightarrow \alpha$, add $\langle S \rightarrow .\alpha, 0, 0 \rangle$ to the chart.

20

2. For every pair of edges of the form $\langle A \rightarrow \alpha.X\beta, i, k \rangle$ and $\langle X \rightarrow \gamma., k, j \rangle$ in the chart, add $\langle A \rightarrow \alpha X.\beta, i, j \rangle$ to the chart.

25

3. For every edge of the form $\langle A \rightarrow \alpha.a_j\beta, i, j-1 \rangle$ in the chart, where a_j is the j th terminal in the input, add $\langle A \rightarrow \alpha a_j.\beta, i, j \rangle$ to the chart.

4. For every edge of the form $\langle X \rightarrow \gamma., k, j \rangle$ in the chart and every grammar production with X as its left-most daughter, of the form $B \rightarrow X\delta$, if

there is an incomplete edge in the chart ending at k , $\langle A \rightarrow \alpha.C\beta, i, k \rangle$, such that B is a left corner of C , add $\langle B \rightarrow X.\delta, k, j \rangle$ to the chart.

- 5 5. For every input terminal a_j and every grammar production with a_j as its left-most daughter, of the form $B \rightarrow a_j\delta$, if there is an incomplete edge in the chart ending at $j-1$, $\langle A \rightarrow \alpha.C\beta, i, j-1 \rangle$, such that B is a left corner of C ,
10 add $\langle B \rightarrow a_j.\delta, j-1, j \rangle$ to the chart.

Note that for Rules 4 and 5 to be executed efficiently, parsing should be performed strictly left-to-right, so that every incomplete edge ending
15 at k has already been computed before any left-corner checks are performed for new edges proposed from complete edges or input terminals starting at k . Apart from this constraint that requires every edge ending at any point k to be generated before any
20 edges ending at points greater than k , individual applications of Rules 1-5 may be intermixed in any order. An input string is successfully parsed as a sentence by this algorithm if the chart contains an edge of the form $\langle S \rightarrow \alpha., 0, n \rangle$ when the algorithm
25 terminates.

This formulation of left-corner chart parsing is essentially known. Another prior publication

describes a similar algorithm, but formulated in terms of a graph-structured stack of the sort generally associated with another form of parsing called generalized LR parsing, rather than in terms of a chart.

Several additional optimizations can be added to this basic schema. One prior technique adds bottom-up filtering of incomplete edges based on the next terminal in the input. That is, no incomplete edge of the form $\langle A \rightarrow \alpha.X\beta, i, j \rangle$ is added to the chart unless a_{j+1} is a left corner of X . Another prior author proposes that, rather than iterate over all the incomplete edges ending at a given input position each time a left-corner check is performed, compute just once for each input position the set of nonterminal predictions of the incomplete edges ending at that position, and iterate over that set for each left-corner check at the position. With this optimization, it is no longer necessary to add initial edges to the chart at position 0 for productions of the form $S \rightarrow \alpha$. If P_i denotes the set of predictions for position i , we simply let $P_0 = \{S\}$.

Another prior optimization results from the observation that in prior context-free grammar parsing algorithms, the daughters to the left of the dot in an item play no role in the parsing algorithm; thus the representation of items can ignore the

daughters to the left of the dot, resulting in fewer distinct edges to be considered. This observation is equally true for left-corner parsing. Thus, instead of $A \rightarrow B_1 B_2 . B_3$, one writes simply $A \rightarrow . B_3$. Note that
5 with this optimization, $A \rightarrow .$ becomes the notation for an item all of whose daughters have been recognized; the only information it contains being just the mother of the production. The present discussion proceeds therefore by writing complete edges simply
10 as $\langle A, i, j \rangle$, rather than $\langle A \rightarrow ., i, j \rangle$. One can also unify the treatment of terminal symbols in the input with complete edges in the chart by adding a complete edge $\langle a_i, i-1, i \rangle$, to the chart for every input terminal a_i .

15 Taking all these optimizations together, we can define a known optimized left-corner parsing algorithm by the following set of parsing rules:

- 20 1. Let $P_0 = \{S\}$.
2. For every input position $j > 0$, let $P_j = \{B \mid$
there is an incomplete edge in the chart ending
at j , of the form $\langle A \rightarrow . B \alpha, i, j \rangle\}$.
- 25 3. For every input terminal a_i , add $\langle a_i, i-1, i \rangle$
to the chart.
4. For every pair of edges $\langle A \rightarrow . X Y \alpha, i, k \rangle$ and

$\langle X, k, j \rangle$ in the chart, if a_{j+1} is a left corner of Y , add $\langle A \rightarrow .Y\alpha, i, j \rangle$ to the chart.

5. For every pair of edges $\langle A \rightarrow .X, i, k \rangle$ and
5 $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ in the chart, add $\langle A, i, j \rangle$ to the chart.

6. For every edge $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ in the chart and
every grammar production with X as its left-most
daughter, of the form $A \rightarrow XY\alpha$, if there is a $B \in$
10 P_k such that A is a left corner of B , and a_{j+1} is
a left corner of Y , add $\langle A \rightarrow .Y\alpha, k, j \rangle$ to the
chart.

7. For every edge $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ in the chart and every
15 grammar production with X as its only daughter,
of the form $A \rightarrow X$, if there is a $B \in P_k$ such
that A is a left corner of B , add $\langle A, k, j \rangle$ to the
chart.

ORDER OF FILTERING CHECKS

20 Note that in Rule 6, the top-down left-corner
check on the mother of the proposed incomplete edge
and the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction
of the proposed incomplete edge are independent of
each other, and therefore could be performed in
25 either order. For each proposed edge, the top-down
check determines whether the mother A of the grammar
production is a left-corner of any prediction at
input position k , in order to determine whether the

production is consistent with what has already been recognized. This requires examining an entry in a left-corner table for each of the elements of the prediction list (i.e., the predictions in the incomplete edges), until a check succeeds or the list is exhausted. The bottom-up check determines whether the terminal in the $j+1$ st position (a_{j+1}) of the input is a left-corner of Y . This requires examining only one entry in the left-corner table.

10

Therefore, in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention, the bottom-up check is performed before the top-down check, since the top-down check need not be performed if the bottom-up check fails. It has been found experimentally that performing the filtering steps in this order is always faster, by as much as 31%.

FIGS. 3A-3C are flow diagrams that illustrate the performance of the filtering (or checking) steps in greater detail in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. FIG. 3 illustrates that, for every edge of the form $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ in the chart being constructed, and for every grammar production with X as its left-most daughter, of the form $A \rightarrow XY\alpha$, the bottom-up left-corner filtering step is performed on the prediction Y of the proposed incomplete edge $\langle A \rightarrow .Y\alpha, k, j \rangle$. This is indicated by blocks 154, 156 and 158 in FIG. 3A. Next, it is determined whether the

bottom-up left-corner check has been satisfied. This is indicated by block 160. If the check has not been satisfied, then the proposed incomplete edge is not added to the chart and the filtering step is completed. However, if the bottom-up left-corner check has been satisfied, then the top-down left-corner check is performed on the mother A of the proposed incomplete edge $\langle A \rightarrow .Y\alpha, k, j \rangle$. This is indicated by block 162.

10

It is next determined whether the top-down left-corner check has been satisfied. If not, again the proposed incomplete edge is not added to the chart and the filtering procedure is complete. If so, however, then the proposed incomplete edge $\langle A \rightarrow .Y\alpha, k, j \rangle$ is added to the chart. This is indicated by blocks 164 and 166 in FIG. 3A.

FIG. 3B is a more detailed flow diagram illustrating the performance of the bottom-up left-corner test on the prediction Y of the proposed incomplete edge. First, the next terminal in the input text is examined by parser 150. This is indicated by block 168 in FIG. 3B. The left-corner table is then accessed. The left-corner table, in one embodiment, can be thought of as a set of pairs of the form (X, Y) , meaning that X is a left corner of Y . The left-corner table can be implemented, in one embodiment, in the form of nested hash tables. It is

determined whether the left-corner table contains an entry for the pair consisting of the next input terminal and the left-corner of the prediction Y . If not, then the prediction Y cannot be correct and thus
5 the proposed incomplete edge under consideration cannot be correct so it is not added to the chart. This is indicated by blocks 170 and 171 in FIG. 3B.

However, if the next input terminal and the
10 prediction Y do satisfy the left-corner check, then the bottom-up left-corner test is satisfied and the top-down left-corner check can be performed. This is indicated by block 172 in FIG. 3B.

FIG. 3C illustrates the top-down left-corner
15 check on the mother A of the proposed edge in greater detail. The top-down check is basically checking to see whether the mother of the proposed incomplete edge is consistent with edges previously found in the
20 input text. Therefore, a prediction from the incomplete edges ending at the corresponding input position is selected from the chart. Next, the left-corner table is examined to see whether the mother A is a left corner of that prediction. This is
25 indicated by blocks 174 and 176 in FIG. 3C. If not, then the production with A as its mother is inconsistent with the incomplete edges containing the selected prediction. This is repeated until a match is found or no predictions are left to be tested. At

that point, if no match has been found, the top-down left-corner check is not satisfied. This is indicated by blocks 177 and 178, and the production is not added to the chart.

5

However, if the mother A is a left-corner of a prediction of an incomplete edge already in the chart ending at the corresponding input position, then the top-down left-corner test is satisfied, meaning that the production with A as its mother is, to this point, still consistent with edges that have already been found in the input text. This is indicated by block 180 in FIG. 3C.

15

BOTTOM-UP PREFIX MERGING

In left-to-right parsing, if two grammar productions share a common left prefix, e.g., $A \rightarrow BC$ and $A \rightarrow BD$, many current parsing algorithms duplicate work for the two productions until reaching the point where they differ. A simple solution often proposed to address this problem is to "left factor" the grammar. Left factoring applies the following grammar transformation repeatedly, until it is no longer applicable.

25

For each nonterminal A, let α be the longest nonempty sequence such that there is more than one grammar production of the form $A \rightarrow \alpha\beta$. Replace the set of productions $A \rightarrow \alpha\beta_1, \dots, A \rightarrow$

$\alpha\beta_n$ with $A \rightarrow \alpha A'$, $A' \rightarrow \beta_1$, ..., $A' \rightarrow \beta_n$, where A' is a new nonterminal symbol.

Left factoring applies only to sets of
5 productions with a common mother category, but as an essentially bottom-up method, LC parsing does most of its work before the mother of a production is determined. Another grammar transformation was introduced in prior parsing techniques, as follows:

10

Let α be the longest sequence of at least two symbols such that there is more than one grammar production of the form $A \rightarrow \alpha\beta$. Replace the set of productions $A_1 \rightarrow \alpha\beta_1$, ..., $A_n \rightarrow \alpha\beta_n$ with $A' \rightarrow$
15 α , $A_1 \rightarrow A'\beta_1$, ..., $A_n \rightarrow A'\beta_n$ where A' is a new nonterminal symbol.

Like left factoring, this transformation is repeated until it is no longer applicable. While this
20 transformation has been applied to left-corner stack based parsing it has never been applied to left-corner chart parsing. In that context, and in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention, it is referred to herein as "bottom-up
25 prefix merging".

FIGs. 4 and 5 are flow diagrams illustrating the application of bottom-up prefix merging in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. First,

the productions in the grammar are examined to find multiple productions having the longest sequence of at least two similar symbols in the left-most position on the right hand side of the different productions. This is indicated by block 300 in FIG. 4. Then, the bottom-up prefix merging transformation is applied to those productions, regardless of whether the mother of the productions is the same. This is indicated by block 302. The transformed grammar productions are then output as the new grammar. This is indicated by block 304.

FIG. 5 is a flow diagram illustrating the application of the bottom-up prefix merging transformation in more detail. First, the set of productions in the grammar that have the form illustrated in block 306 are retrieved. The retrieved productions are transformed into productions of another form illustrated in block 308 of FIG. 5. The steps of retrieving the set of productions and transforming those productions are iterated on until the transform is no longer applicable. This is indicated by block 310 in FIG. 5.

25

It can thus be seen that this transformation examines the prefix of the right hand side of the productions to eliminate duplication of work for two productions that have a similar prefix on their right

hand sides, regardless of the mother of the production.

It has been found experimentally that left
5 factoring generally makes left-corner chart parsing
slower rather than faster. Bottom-up prefix merging,
on the other hand, speeds up left-corner chart
parsing by as much as 70%.

10 INDEXING PRODUCTIONS BY NEXT INPUT SYMBOL

In general, it is most efficient to store the
grammar productions for parsing in a data structure
that partially combines productions that share
elements in common, in the order that those elements
15 are examined by the parsing algorithm. Therefore, the
grammar productions for the present left-corner chart
parser are stored as a discrimination tree,
implemented as a set of nested hash tables. In
addition, productions with only one daughter are
20 stored separately from those with more than one
daughter. One way to define a data structure for the
latter is illustrated in FIG. 6A.

FIG. 6A shows that a first data portion in the
25 data structure 200 is an index that contains pointers
to data structures for productions indexed by their
left-most daughter 202. This is because left-corner
parsing proposes a grammar production when its left-
most daughter has been found, so productions are

indexed first by that. Data structure 200 also includes copies of a data structure 204, which indexes pointers to data structures for productions by a next daughter so that the input symbol can be
5 checked against the next daughter to see whether the next daughter has the input symbol as a left corner. This is because when a production is proposed, the next daughter is checked to see whether it has the next input symbol as a left corner. This requires
10 each entry in index 204 to be checked against the next input symbol.

Data structure 200 also includes copies of a data structure 206, which indexes pointers to data
15 structures for productions by the mother of the productions. This is so that a top-down check can be preformed to see whether the mother is a left corner of some previous prediction. This ensures that the mother of the production is consistent with what has
20 been found in the chart so far. Finally, the remaining portions of the productions are enumerated. This is indicated by data portion 208 and data structure 200.

25 FIG. 6B illustrates the direction of tracing through the data structure 200 in performing the various checks just described. FIG. 6B further illustrates that each data structure holds a set of pointers to data structures for productions based

upon the index criteria. For example, data portion 202 holds pointers to data structures for productions based on the left corner of those productions. Therefore, as the input text is being analyzed, data
5 portion 202 is accessed and the partial analysis of the input text is compared against the values in data portion 202. When a match is found, the pointer associated with that match is provided such that productions are identified that satisfy the left
10 corner criteria indexed in data portion 202.

The pointer, in one embodiment, points to a copy of data portion 204 that indexes the productions by the possible next daughters for productions having
15 the left corner matched in data portion 202. When a match is found in performing the left-corner check against the next input symbol, a pointer is obtained which points to a copy of data portion 206 that indexes productions with the given left corner and
20 next daughter by their mother such that a determination can be made as to whether the currently hypothesized productions are consistent with what has been previously identified (i.e., whether the mother of the production is the left corner of some previous
25 prediction). Finally, the remainders of the productions with a given left corner, next daughter, and mother are retrieved from the values in a copy of data portion 208.

A way to store the productions that results in faster parsing, in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention, is to precompute which productions are consistent with which input symbols, by defining a structure that for each possible input symbol contains a discrimination tree just for the productions whose second daughters have that input symbol as a left corner. This entire structure is therefore set out in the order shown for structure 212 in FIG. 7A:

As the parser works from left to right, at each point in the input, it looks up the sub-structure for the productions consistent with the next symbol in the input. It processes them as before, except that the check that the second daughter has the next input symbol as a left corner is omitted, since that check was precomputed.

FIGs. 7A and 7B illustrate data structure 212 used in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. Data portions which are the same as those found in FIGs. 6A and 6B are correspondingly numbered. However, rather than beginning by indexing the productions according to the left corner (or left-most daughter), data structure 212 begins by indexing productions whose second daughters have, as a left corner, the next input symbol. This is indicated by data portion 214. In one embodiment,

data portion 214 holds pointers to data structures for productions that have the next input symbol as a left corner to its second daughter. These pointers, in one embodiment, point to copies of data portion 5 202 that point to copies of data portions 206, and so on. The analysis then continues as discussed with respect to FIG. 6B, through the data portions 206 and 209. It will be noted that data portion 209 now also contains the second daughters that were 10 separated out in the original method of indexing described with respect to FIGs. 6A and 6B.

This way of indexing the productions can tend to increase storage requirements. However, since the 15 entire structure is indexed first by input symbol, it is only necessary to load that part of the structure indexed by symbols that actually occur in the text being parsed. The part of the structure for the most common words of the language are illustratively pre- 20 loaded; and since words seen once in a given text tend to be repeated, all of the structure that is loaded is illustratively retained until processing is complete or until it switches to an unrelated text.

25 GRAMMAR FLATTENING

One possible way of reducing the amount of work a parser has to do is to remove levels of structure from the grammar. For example, instead of the productions:

$NP \rightarrow Name$

$Name \rightarrow john$

$Name \rightarrow mary$

5

One could omit the category *Name* altogether, and simply use the productions:

$NP \rightarrow john$

10

$NP \rightarrow mary$

Techniques for removing levels of structure from the grammar can be referred to by the general term
15 "grammar flattening".

FIGs. 8 and 9 are graphs which further illustrate the concept of grammar flattening for the phrase "a young boy". In FIG. 8, the head node of the graph is a
20 noun phrase and it extends four levels deep, ending with the words in the phrase. In FIG. 9, the grammar has been flattened such that it extends only three levels deep. In FIG. 9, the graph has a noun phrase
25 head node and three descendent nodes (a determiner, an adjective, and a noun). The actual words in the phrase "a young boy" descend from these three descendent nodes.

In general, grammars can be flattened by taking

a production, and substituting the sequence of daughters in the production for occurrences of the mother of the production in other productions. This does not always result in faster parsing.

5

However, in accordance with the embodiments of the present invention, a number of specific ways of grammar flattening have been developed that are effective in speeding up left-corner chart parsing.

10 The first method is referred to as "elimination of single-option chain rules". If there exists a nonterminal symbol A that appears on the left-hand side of a single production $A \rightarrow X$, where X is a single terminal or nonterminal symbol, $A \rightarrow X$ is referred to as a "single-option chain rule". Single
15 option chain rules can be eliminated from a context-free grammar without changing the language allowed by the grammar, simply by omitting the production, and substituting the single daughter of the production
20 for the mother of the production everywhere else in the grammar.

Elimination of single-option chain rules is perhaps the only method of grammar flattening that is
25 guaranteed not to increase the size or complexity of the grammar. Grammar flattening involving nonterminals defined by multiple productions can result in a combinatorial increase in the size of the grammar. However, in accordance with one embodiment

of the present invention, it has been found that if flattening is confined to the leftmost daughters of productions, increased parsing speeds can be achieved without undue increases in grammar size. These
5 techniques are referred to herein as "left-corner grammar flattening". Two techniques of left-corner grammar flattening that generally speed up left-corner chart parsing are as follows:

- 10 **Technique 1:** For each nonterminal A , such that
- A is not a left-recursive category and
 - A does not occur as a daughter of a rule except
15 as the left-most daughter,
- do the following:
- For each production of the form $A \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_n$ and
20 each production of the form $B \rightarrow A\alpha$, add $B \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_n\alpha$ to the grammar.
 - Remove all productions containing A from the
25 grammar.

Technique 2: For each nonterminal A , such that

- A is not a left-recursive category,

- A does not occur as a daughter of a rule except as the left-most daughter, and

- 5
- there is some production that has A as the mother and at least one nonterminal as a daughter,

do the following:

10

- For each production of the form $A \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_n$ and each production of the form $B \rightarrow A\alpha$, add $B \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_n \alpha$ to the grammar.

- 15
- Remove all productions containing A from the grammar.

FIGs. 10 and 11 are flow diagrams illustrating techniques 1 and 2 discussed above, in greater
20 detail. Techniques 1 and 2 restrict the implementation of the grammar flattening to only non-left-recursive categories and only if those categories only appear in a left corner position. Further, according to technique 2, the flattening
25 operation is only preformed if the category has at least one daughter that is also a category. This additional restriction makes parsing slightly slower, but results in a much more compact grammar.

Therefore, technique 1 discussed above first determines whether the category is a non-left-recursive category. This is indicated by block 340 in FIG. 10. If not, the grammar flattening operation is not preformed. If so, then it is determined whether the category only appears as a daughter of a production if it is the left corner of that production. This is indicated by block 342. If not, again the flattening operation is not preformed.

10

If so, however, then the grammar is first flattened by adding productions, as identified in block 344, and then removing all productions containing the identified category from the grammar. This is indicated in block 346.

15

Technique 2, illustrated in FIG. 11, has a number of steps which are similar to those found in technique 1, illustrated in FIG. 10. Those steps are similarly numbered. Therefore, technique 2 first determines whether the category A is non-left-recursive and whether A only appears as a daughter of a production if it is the left corner of the production. This is indicated by blocks 340 and 342. However, FIG. 11 illustrates that, prior to performing the grammar flattening, it is determined whether there is a production that has the category A as its mother and at least one non-terminal as a daughter. This is indicated by block 348. If not,

20

25

then the grammar flattening step would only minimally speed up parsing, at the expense of significantly increasing the grammar size, so the grammar flattening step is not performed. If so, however, then the two steps illustrated by blocks 344 and 346 in which productions are added to the grammar and all productions containing the category A are removed from the grammar (as discussed with respect to FIG. 10) are preformed.

10

It should be noted that a nonterminal is left-recursive if it is a proper left corner of itself, where X is recursively defined to be a proper left corner of A if the grammar contains a production of the form $A \rightarrow X\alpha$ or a production of the form $B \rightarrow X\alpha$, where B is a proper left corner of A. This and the elimination of left recursion are discussed in greater detail in the above-referenced co-pending patent application.

20

ANNOTATING CHART EDGES FOR EXTRACTION OF PARSES

The previously mentioned prior art technique of omitting recognized daughters from items leads to issues regarding how parses are to be extracted from the chart. The daughters to the left of the dot in an item are often used for this purpose in item-based methods. However, other methods suggest storing with each non-initial edge in the chart a list that includes, for each derivation of the edge, a pair of

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161

pointers to the preceding edges (complete and incomplete edges) that caused it to be derived. This provides sufficient information to extract the parses without additional searching, even without the daughters to the left of the dot.

One embodiment of the present invention yields further benefits. For each derivation of a non-initial edge, it is sufficient to attach to the edge, by way of annotation, only the mother category and the starting position of the complete edge that was used in the last step of the derivation. It should also be noted that in left-corner parsing, only non-initial edges are ever added to the chart; however, this technique for annotating chart edges and extracting parses also works for other parsing methods that do create initial edges in the chart.

FIG. 12A illustrates a data structure 350 which is attached to (or pointed to by) an edge in a chart being developed. Data structure 350 simply includes two portions. The first portion 352 contains the category of the mother of the complete edge used in the last step of deriving the non-initial edge. The second data portion 354, simply contains the starting position in the input text of the complete edge, the mother of which is identified in portion 352. By storing one of these structures for each derivation

of an edge, the edges can be traced back to obtain a full analysis of the input text.

Every non-initial edge is derived by combining a
5 complete edge with an incomplete edge. Suppose $\langle A \rightarrow .\beta, k, j \rangle$ is a derived edge, and it is known that the complete edge used to derive this edge had category X and start position i . It is then known that the complete edge must have been $\langle X, i, j \rangle$, since the
10 complete edge and the derived edge must have the same end position. It is further known that the incomplete edge used in the derivation must have been $\langle A \rightarrow .X\beta, k, i \rangle$, since that is the only incomplete edge that could have combined with the complete edge to
15 produce the derived edge. Any complete edge can thus be traced back to find the complete edges for all the daughters that derived it. The trace terminates when an incomplete edge is reached that has the same start point as the complete edge it was derived from.
20 These "local" derivations can be pieced together to obtain a full analysis of the input text.

For example, suppose that one has derived a complete edge $\langle S, 0, 9 \rangle$ as illustrated in FIG. 12B,
25 which we can also show as 358 (written in expanded notation). It can be seen that if the data structure 360 (representing the last complete edge used in deriving edge 358) is attached to 358, where 7 is the beginning or initial position of a complete edge of

category C , then one knows that 358 must have been derived by combining the complete edge $\langle C, 7, 9 \rangle$, 361, and the incomplete edge $\langle S \rightarrow .C, 0, 7 \rangle$, 362. If the incomplete edge 362 occurs in the chart with the data structure 364 attached, one can see that 362 must have been derived from the complete edge $\langle B, 5, 7 \rangle$, 365, and the incomplete edge $\langle S \rightarrow .BC, 0, 5 \rangle$, 366. Then if the data structure 368 is attached to 366, one can see that 366 must have been derived from the complete edge $\langle A, 0, 5 \rangle$, 369, and the production $S \rightarrow ABC$, 371. One can tell that this was a production rather than another non-initial incomplete edge, because 368 and 366 have the same start point. Thus we know that the original complete edge $\langle S, 0, 9 \rangle$ was derived from the sequence of complete edges $\langle A, 0, 5 \rangle$, $\langle B, 5, 7 \rangle$, and $\langle C, 7, 9 \rangle$. Since the categories of these complete edges may not be terminals, the trace-back process may need to be repeated for one or more of these complete edges as well. Using the derivation data structures attached to the chart records for these edges, we can recursively extract the complete analysis of the entire sentence, down to the level of words.

25

FIG. 13 is a flow diagram illustrating how the information for the complete edges is stored. When a non-initial edge E is derived and added to the

chart, (as indicated by block 370) the mother category and the starting position of the complete edge that was used to derive the non-initial edge E are stored in the form of the data structure 350 illustrated in
5 FIG. 12A. This is indicated by block 372. Finally, a pointer from the derived edge E to the mother and starting position stored at block 372 are also stored. This is indicated by block 374. It can thus be seen that data structure 350 is quite abbreviated,
10 and no pointer to an incomplete edge is even needed.

FIGS. 14A and 14B are flow diagrams which better illustrate the trace-back process. First, in general, parsing proceeds left to right until there are no more words in the input sentence. Then it can
15 be determined whether there is a complete parse of the input by examining the chart to see if there is a complete edge of category S spanning the entire input, from 0 to n , if there are n words in the input sentence. If the application needs to retrieve the
20 analyses of the sentence at this point, then it initiates the trace-back process, beginning with the complete edge $\langle S, 0, n \rangle$. Initiation of the trace-back process is indicated by block 376. The pointer to the derivation data structure associated with the
25 derived edge currently under consideration is examined as indicated by block 378. The edge category and its starting position for some derivation of the edge, which are pointed to at block 378, are then retrieved. This is indicated by block

380. It should be noted that an edge may have several derivations, with a category/starting position pair stored for each derivation. If one chooses only one pair for each edge, a single analysis for the sentence is obtained. To obtain all analyses, one must iterate through all derivations. The ending position of the complete edge is then determined based on the ending position of the derived edge. This is indicated by block 382. The incomplete edge used in the most recent derivation is computed. This is indicated by block 384. The computed incomplete edge is then located in the chart, and it is determined whether more complete edges need to be retrieved. This is indicated by blocks 386 and 388. If so, the pointers associated with the most recently computed incomplete edge are examined for the location of the next edge category and starting position which needs to be retrieved. This is indicated by block 390. Processing then reverts to block 380 wherein the complete edge category and its starting position are retrieved.

After all of the complete edges that compose the original derived edge have been retrieved, the ones for nonterminal categories are traced back recursively and the results are assembled into a complete analysis of the edge originally being traced back. This is indicated by block 392.

FIG. 14B is a more detailed flow diagram illustrating how the decision in block 388 is made (and consequently how the trace-back terminates). It is determined whether the starting position of the most recently computed incomplete edge is the same as the most recently retrieved complete edge which it was derived from. This is indicated by block 394 in FIG. 14B. If the starting positions are not the same, then additional edges need to be retrieved in order to obtain the full analysis of the input text segment. This is indicated by block 396. If the starting positions are the same, then the most recent computation has yielded a production rather than an incomplete edge and no more edges need to be retrieved at this level of processing.

It can thus be seen that the present invention provides a number of techniques and embodiments for improving the speed and efficiency of parsing, and in some cases, specifically left-corner chart parsing. These improvements have been seen to increase the speed of the left-corner chart-parsing algorithm by as much as 40 percent over the best prior art methods currently known. These techniques can be used alone or in any combination of ways to obtain advantages and benefits over prior left-corner chart parsers.

Although the present invention has been described with reference to preferred embodiments,

workers skilled in the art will recognize that changes may be made in form and detail without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48106-1000
SERIALS ACQUISITION
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106-1000
TEL: (313) 763-7000
FAX: (313) 763-7000
WWW: WWW.LIBRARY.MICHIGAN.EDU

WHAT IS CLAIMED IS:

1. A method of parsing an input text segment according to a left-corner chart parsing technique which populates a chart according to a plurality of productions, the method comprising:

receiving the input text segment;

generating proposed incomplete edges, with mothers and predictions, based on the set of productions and based on the input text segment;

for each proposed incomplete edge:

performing a bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge; and

if the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge is successful, performing a top-down left-corner check on the mother of the proposed incomplete edge, otherwise, not adding the proposed incomplete edge to the chart.

2. The method of claim 1 and further comprising:

if the proposed incomplete edge passes both the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge and the top-down left-corner check on the mother of the proposed incomplete edge,

populating the chart with the proposed incomplete edge.

3. The method of claim 1 wherein performing the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge comprises:

for every complete edge of the form $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ in the chart and every production with X as its left-most daughter, of the form $A \rightarrow XY\alpha$, determining whether the $j+1^{\text{st}}$ terminal input symbol, a_{j+1} , is a left corner of Y , wherein $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ represents a terminal or nonterminal which begins at a k th position in the input text segment and ends at the j th position in the input text segment, Y represents a terminal or nonterminal, α represents a sequence of terminals or nonterminals, and A represents a category which is the mother of the production.

4. The method of claim 3 wherein determining whether the $j+1^{\text{st}}$ terminal input symbol, a_{j+1} , is a left corner of Y , comprises:

examining a left-corner table to determine whether it contains a pair of values including the $j+1^{\text{st}}$ terminal input and the left corner of prediction Y .

5. The method of claim 4 wherein, if the left-corner table includes the pair, concluding that the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction is satisfied, and if not, concluding that the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction is not satisfied.

6. The method of claim 1 wherein performing the top-down left-corner check on the mother of the proposed incomplete edge comprises:

for every complete edge of the form $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ in the chart and every production with X as its left-most daughter, of the form $A \rightarrow XY\alpha$, determining whether there is a B which is an element of P_k , such that A is a left corner of B , wherein B represents a category and P_k represents a set of predictions of incomplete edges in the chart ending at position k in the input text segment, wherein the prediction of an incomplete edge is a first as yet unmatched symbol of the incomplete edge.

7. The method of claim 6 wherein determining whether there is a B which is an element of P_k , such that A is a left-corner of B , comprises:

examining a left-corner table to determine whether it indicates that A is a left corner of B .

8. The method of claim 7 wherein, if the left-corner table indicates that *A* is a left corner of *B*, adding the proposed incomplete edge to the chart, otherwise, not adding the proposed incomplete edge to the chart.

9. A left-corner chart parser configured to populate a chart according to productions by performing the steps of:

receiving the input text segment;

generating proposed incomplete edges, with mothers and predictions, based on the set of productions and based on the input text segment;

for each proposed incomplete edge:

performing a bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge; and

if the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge is successful, performing a top-down left-corner check on the mother of the proposed incomplete edge, otherwise, not adding the proposed incomplete edge to the chart.

10. A computer readable medium containing instructions which, when executed, cause the computer to parse an input text segment according to a left-corner chart

parsing method which populates a chart according to a plurality of productions, the method comprising:

- receiving the input text segment;
- generating proposed incomplete edges, with mothers and predictions, based on the set of productions and based on the input text segment;

- for each proposed incomplete edge:

- performing a bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge; and

- if the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge is successful, performing a top-down left-corner check on the mother of the proposed incomplete edge, otherwise, not adding the proposed incomplete edge to the chart.

11. The computer readable medium of claim 10 and further comprising:

- if the proposed incomplete edge passes both the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge and the top-down left-corner check on the mother of the proposed incomplete edge, populating the chart with the proposed incomplete edge.

12. The computer readable medium of claim 10 wherein performing the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction of the proposed incomplete edge comprises:

for every complete edge of the form $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ in the chart and every production with X as its left-most daughter, of the form $A \rightarrow XY\alpha$, determining whether the $j+1^{\text{st}}$ terminal input symbol, a_{j+1} , is a left corner of Y , wherein $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ represents a terminal or nonterminal which begins at a k th position in the input text segment and ends at the j th position in the input text segment, Y represents a terminal or nonterminal, α represents a sequence of terminals or nonterminals, and A represents a category which is the mother of the production.

13. The computer readable medium of claim 12 wherein determining whether the $j+1^{\text{st}}$ terminal input symbol, a_{j+1} , is a left corner of Y , comprises:

examining a left-corner table to determine whether it contains a pair of values including the $j+1^{\text{st}}$ terminal input and the left corner of prediction Y .

14. The computer readable medium of claim 13 wherein, if the left-corner table includes the pair, concluding that the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction

is satisfied, and if not, concluding that the bottom-up left-corner check on the prediction is not satisfied.

15. The computer readable medium of claim 10 wherein performing the top-down left-corner check on the mother of the proposed incomplete edge comprises:

for every complete edge of the form $\langle X, k, j \rangle$ in the chart and every production with X as its left-most daughter, of the form $A \rightarrow XY\alpha$, determining whether there is a B which is an element of P_k , such that A is a left corner of B , wherein B represents a category and P_k represents a set of predictions of incomplete edges in the chart ending at position k in the input text segment, wherein the prediction of an incomplete edge is a first as yet unmatched symbol of the incomplete edge.

16. The computer readable medium of claim 15 wherein determining whether there is a B which is an element of P_k , such that A is a left-corner of B , comprises:

examining a left-corner table to determine whether it indicates that A is a left corner of B .

17. The computer readable medium of claim 16 wherein, if the left-corner table indicates that A is a left corner of B , adding the proposed incomplete edge to the

chart, otherwise, not adding the proposed incomplete edge to the chart.

18. A method of indexing productions for use in a left-corner chart parser which parses input text containing input symbols, the method comprising:
indexing the productions first based on input symbols which are consistent with the productions.
19. The method of claim 18 wherein indexing comprises:
precomputing which of the productions are consistent with which of the input symbols.
20. The method of claim 19 wherein precomputing comprises:
precomputing, for each possible input symbol, which productions have a second daughter with that input symbol as a left corner.
21. The method of claim 20 wherein indexing, comprises:
generating a data structure that, for each of the possible input symbols, includes a discrimination tree just for productions having a second daughter with that input symbol as a left corner.

22. The method of claim 18 and further comprising:
indexing the productions next based on a left-
most daughter of the productions.
23. The method of claim 22 and further comprising:
indexing the productions next based on a mother
of the productions.
24. The method of claim 23 and further comprising:
enumerating the productions based on remainder
of the productions, other than the left-
most daughter and the mother.
25. A method of parsing input text using a left-
corner chart parsing process, comprising:
receiving an input symbol in the input text;
accessing an input symbol index to obtain
productions having the input symbol as a
left corner of the second daughter; and
after obtaining the productions having the input
symbol as a left corner of the second
daughter, accessing other indices to the
productions.
26. The method of claim 25 wherein the input symbol
index comprises a portion of a discrimination tree
for only the productions having a second daughter
with the input symbol as a left corner of the

second daughter, and wherein accessing the index comprises:

traversing the discrimination tree.

27. The method of claim 25 wherein accessing other indices comprises:

accessing a left-most daughter index to obtain productions based on their left-most daughter.

28. The method of claim 27 wherein accessing other indices comprises:

accessing a mother index to obtain productions based on their mother.

29. The method of claim 28 and further comprising:
accessing a list containing a completion of productions that are obtained by accessing the left-most daughter index and the mother index.

30. A data structure indexing productions used in a left-corner chart parser which parses input text, the data structure comprising:

a first index portion indexing the productions first based on input symbols which are consistent with the productions.

31. The data structure of claim 30 wherein the first index portion indexes productions by input symbol based on which productions have the input symbol as a left corner of the second daughter.

32. The data structure of claim 31 and further comprising:

a second index portion indexing the productions based on a left-most daughter of the productions.

33. The data structure of claim 32 and further comprising:

a third index portion indexing the productions based on a mother of the productions.

34. The data structure of claim 33 and further comprising:

a fourth portion enumerating the productions based on a remainder of the productions, other than the left-most daughter and the mother of the productions.

35 The data structure of claim 34 wherein the first, second, third and fourth portions comprise a discrimination tree implemented as a set of nested hash tables.

36. A method of transforming a grammar used in left-corner chart parsing, wherein the grammar includes a set of productions, each production having a mother, the method comprising:

applying a bottom-up prefix merging transformation regardless of the mother of the production; and
providing a transformed grammar.

37. The method of claim 36 wherein applying a bottom-up prefix merging transformation comprises:

identifying productions having similar symbols in similar positions on a right side of the productions; and
applying the bottom-up prefix merging transformation to the identified productions regardless of the mother of the identified productions.

38. The method of claim 37 wherein identifying productions comprises:

identifying productions having similar prefix symbols on the right side of the productions.

39. The method of claim 36 wherein applying a bottom-up prefix merging transformation comprises:

identifying productions of the form $A_1 \rightarrow \alpha\beta_1$,
..., $A_n \rightarrow \alpha\beta_n$, where α is a sequence of two

or more symbols, and transforming the identified productions into transformed productions of the form $A' \rightarrow \alpha$, $A_1 \rightarrow A'\beta_1$, ..., $A_n \rightarrow A'\beta_n$, where A' is a new nonterminal symbol.

40. The method of claim 39 and further comprising:
repeating the steps of identifying and
transforming until no further productions
are identified.

41. A computer readable medium having stored thereon
a data structure comprising a grammar used in left-
corner chart parsing, the grammar including:

a set of productions having mothers, the set of
productions being bottom-up prefix merged
regardless of their mothers.

42. A computer readable medium including
instructions readable by a computer which, when
executed, transform a grammar used in left-corner
chart parsing, the grammar including a set of
productions, and each production having a mother, the
transform comprising:

applying a bottom-up prefix merging
transformation regardless of the mother of
the production; and
providing a transformed grammar.

43. The computer readable medium of claim 42 wherein applying a bottom-up prefix merging transformation comprises:

identifying productions having similar symbols
in similar positions on a right side of the
productions; and
applying the bottom-up prefix merging
transformation to the identified
productions regardless of the mother of the
identified productions.

44. The computer readable medium of claim 43 wherein identifying productions comprises:

identifying productions having similar prefix
symbols on the right side of the
productions.

45. The computer readable medium of claim 42 wherein applying a bottom-up prefix merging transformation comprises:

identifying productions of the form $A_1 \rightarrow \alpha\beta_1$,
..., $A_n \rightarrow \alpha\beta_n$, where α is a sequence of two
or more symbols, and transforming the
identified productions into transformed
productions of the form $A' \rightarrow \alpha$, $A_1 \rightarrow A'\beta_1$,
..., $A_n \rightarrow A'\beta_n$, where A' is a new
nonterminal symbol.

46. A method of flattening a grammar used in left-corner chart parsing, wherein the grammar includes productions, the method comprising:
- eliminating single-option chain rules from the grammar to obtain a flattened grammar; and
 - output the flattened grammar.
47. The method of claim 46 and further comprising:
- identifying single-option chain rules of the form $A \rightarrow X$, where A is a mother, and X is a single terminal or nonterminal daughter, to obtain identified productions.
48. The method of claim 47 wherein eliminating single-option chain rules from the grammar comprises:
- omitting the identified productions from the grammar; and
 - substituting the daughter of the production for the mother of the production in remaining productions of the grammar.
49. A method of flattening a grammar used in left-corner chart parsing, wherein the grammar includes productions, the method comprising:
- flattening the grammar based only on left-most daughters of the productions to obtain a flattened grammar; and
 - outputting the flattened grammar.

50. The method of claim 49 wherein flattening the grammar comprises:

for each nonterminal of the form A, determining whether A is a non-left-recursive category; if so, determining whether A appears as a daughter of a production only if it is a left corner of the production; and if so, flattening the grammar with respect to A.

51. The method of claim 50 wherein flattening the grammar with respect to A comprises:

for each production of the form $A \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_n$, and each production of the form $B \rightarrow A\alpha$, adding $B \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_n\alpha$ to the grammar; and removing all productions containing A from the grammar.

52. The method of claim 50 and further comprising:

prior to flattening the grammar, determining whether there is a production which has A as a mother and at least one nonterminal as a daughter; and if so, only then flattening the grammar with respect to A.

53. A computer readable medium having stored thereon instructions which, when executed, cause the computer to perform a method of flattening a grammar used in left-corner chart parsing, wherein

the grammar includes productions, the method comprising:

eliminating single-option chain rules from the grammar to obtain a flattened grammar; and outputting the flattened grammar.

54. The method of claim 53 and further comprising: identifying single-option chain rules of the form $A \rightarrow X$, where A is a mother, and X is a single terminal or nonterminal daughter, to obtain identified productions.

55. The method of claim 54 wherein eliminating single-option chain rules from the grammar comprises: omitting the identified productions from the grammar; and substituting the daughter of the production for the mother of the production in remaining productions of the grammar.

56. A computer readable medium having stored thereon instructions which, when executed, cause the computer to perform a method of flattening a grammar used in left-corner chart parsing, wherein the grammar includes productions, the method comprising: flattening the grammar based only on left-most daughters of the productions to obtain a flattened grammar; and outputting the flattened grammar.

57. The method of claim 56 wherein flattening the grammar comprises:

for each nonterminal of the form A, determining whether A is a non-left-recursive category; if so, determining whether A appears as a daughter of a production only if it is a left corner of the production; and if so, flattening the grammar with respect to A.

58. The method of claim 57 wherein flattening the grammar with respect to A comprises:

for each production of the form $A \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_n$, and each production of the form $B \rightarrow A\alpha$, adding $B \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_n\alpha$ to the grammar; and removing all productions containing A from the grammar.

59. The method of claim 57 and further comprising:

prior to flattening the grammar, determining whether there is a production which has A as a mother and at least one nonterminal as a daughter; and if so, only then flattening the grammar with respect to A.

60. A computer readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising a grammar used in left-corner chart parsing, the grammar comprising:

a set of productions having single-option chain rules removed therefrom.

61. A computer readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising a grammar used in left-corner chart parsing, the grammar comprising:

a set of flattened productions, flattened based substantially only on left-most daughters of the productions.

62. A method of assembling one or more analyses, based on a derived edge, of an input text parsed using a chart parser, the method comprising:

accessing a pointer associated with the derived edge which points to a first data structure containing a complete edge category and starting position in the input text for a first complete edge used in deriving the derived edge; and

assembling the analysis based on the complete edge category and starting address pointed to.

63. The method of claim 62 and further comprising: prior to assembling the analysis, determining an ending position of the first complete edge.

64. The method of claim 63 and further comprising:

computing an incomplete edge used, with the first complete edge, to derive the derived edge.

65. The method of claim 64 and further comprising: prior to assembling the analysis, determining whether any additional complete edges are to be obtained.

66. The method of claim 65 wherein determining whether any additional complete edges are to be obtained comprises:

determining whether a starting position in the most recently computed incomplete edge is the same as a complete edge it was derived from.

67. The method of claim 62 wherein the pointer associated with the derived edge points to additional data structures containing complete edge categories and starting positions in the input text for additional complete edges used in deriving the derived edge, and wherein assembling comprises assembling additional analyses based on information in the additional data structures.

68. A method of storing edges completed during parsing of an input text, the method comprising: storing in a data structure, only mother categories and starting positions of -

complete edges that were used in a final step of a derivation of a derived edge.

68

69. The method of claim 68 and further comprising:
storing a pointer from the derived non-initial edge to the data structure containing mother categories and starting positions.

69

70. A computer readable medium including a data structure stored thereon, the data structure used in identifying complete edges obtained by performing a parse of an input text to obtain a derived edge, the data structure comprising one or more pairs of data portions including:
a first data portion containing only a category of a mother of a complete edge used to derive the derived edge; and
a second data portion containing only a starting position in the input text of the complete edge used to derive the derived edge, the data structure being formed regardless of an ending position of the complete edge.

70

71. The computer readable medium of claim 70 wherein the data structure is attached to the derived edge.

71

72. A computer readable medium including a data structure stored thereon, the data structure used in identifying complete edges obtained by performing a

chart parse of an input text to obtain a derived edge, the data structure comprising one or more pairs of data portions consisting essentially of:

a first data portion containing a category of a mother of a complete edge used to derive the derived edge; and

a second data portion containing a starting position in the input text of the complete edge used to derive the derived edge.

73. A computer readable medium having stored thereon instructions which, when executed, cause the computer to perform a method of assembling an analysis, based on a derived edge, of an input text parsed using a chart parser, the method comprising:

accessing a pointer associated with the derived edge which points to a first data structure containing a complete edge category and starting position in the input text for a first complete edge used in deriving the derived edge; and

assembling the analysis based on the complete edge category and starting address pointed to.

74. The computer readable medium of claim 73 and further comprising:
prior to assembling the analysis, determining an ending position of the first complete edge.

n4
75.

The computer readable medium of claim 73 and further comprising:

computing an incomplete edge used, with the first complete edge, to derive the derived edge.

95
76.

The computer readable medium of claim 75 and further comprising:

prior to assembling the analysis, determining whether any additional complete edges are to be obtained.

74
77.

The method of claim 76 wherein determining whether any additional complete edges are to be obtained comprises:

determining whether a starting position in the most recently computed incomplete edge is the same as a complete edge it was derived from.

m
78.

The computer readable medium of claim 73 wherein the pointer associated with the derived edge points to additional data structures containing complete edge categories and starting positions in the input text for additional complete edges used in deriving the derived edge, and wherein assembling comprises assembling additional analyses based on information in the additional data structures.

~~78~~ 79. A computer readable medium having stored thereon instructions which, when executed cause the computer to perform a method of storing edges completed during parsing of an input text, the method comprising:

storing in a data structure, only mother categories and starting positions of complete edges that were used in a final step of a derivation of the derived edge.

79
/ 80. The computer readable medium of claim 79 and further comprising:

storing a pointer from the derived non-initial edge to the data structure containing mother categories and starting positions.

IMPROVED LEFT-CORNER CHART PARSING SYSTEM

ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE

Different embodiments of the present invention provide improvements to left-corner chart parsing. The improvements include a specific order of filtering checks, transforming the grammar using bottom-up prefix merging, indexing productions first based on input symbols, grammar flattening, and annotating chart edges for the extraction of parses.

1. A method for parsing a sentence using a left-corner chart parsing system, comprising:
2. receiving a sentence to be parsed;
3. transforming the sentence into a grammar;
4. indexing the grammar based on input symbols;
5. flattening the grammar;
6. annotating the grammar with chart edges;
7. parsing the sentence using the grammar and the chart edges;
8. extracting the parses from the chart edges.

FIG. 1





FIG. 2

INPUT TEXT STRING



ANALYSIS OF INPUT TEXT STRING




FIG. 3A




FIG. 3B




FIG. 3C




FIG. 6A




FIG. 6B

FIG. 7A




FIG. 7B




FIG. 4





FIG. 5






FIG. 8






FIG. 9

FIG. 10

FIG. 11






FIG. 12A




FIG. 12B

FIG. 12B




FIG. 13

FIG. 14A





FIG. 14B



COMBINED DECLARATION AND
POWER OF ATTORNEY
IN ORIGINAL APPLICATION

Attorney Docket No.

M61.12-0308

SPECIFICATION AND INVENTORSHIP IDENTIFICATION

As a below named inventor, I declare that:

My residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below next to my name.

I believe I am the original, first and sole inventor of the subject matter which is claimed, and for which a patent is sought, on the invention entitled IMPROVED LEFT-CORNER CHART PARSING SYSTEM the specification of which,

(check one) ☒ is attached hereto.

☐ was filed on as Appln. Serial No. .

☐ and was amended on .

☐ was described and claimed in PCT International Application No. filed on and as amended under PCT Article 19 on .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF REVIEW OF PAPERS AND DUTY OF CANDOR

I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above identified specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment referred to above. I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is known to me to be material to the patentability of this application in accordance with Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1.56.

PRIORITY CLAIM (35 USC § 119)

I claim foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States Code, § 119 of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate listed below and have also identified below any foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed:

Prior Foreign Application(s)

Number	Country	Day/Month/Year Filed	Priority Claimed
_____	_____	_____	Yes_____ No_____
_____	_____	_____	Yes_____ No_____

PRIORITY CLAIM (35 USC § 120)

I claim the benefit under Title 35, United States Code, § 120 of any United States application(s) listed below. Insofar as the subject matter of each of the claims of this application is not disclosed in the prior United States application in the manner provided by the first paragraph of Title 35 United States Code § 112, I acknowledge the duty to disclose to the Patent Office all information known to me to be material to patentability as defined in Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations § 1.56 which became available between the filing date of the prior application and the national or PCT international filing date of this application:

Appln. Ser. No.	U.S. Serial No. (if any under PCT)	Filing Date	Status
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

DECLARATION

I declare that all statements made herein that are of my own knowledge are true and that all statements that are made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

POWER OF ATTORNEY

I appoint the following attorneys and agents to prosecute the patent application identified above and to transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected therewith, including full power of association, substitution and revocation: Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797; Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847; Nickolas E. Westman, Reg. No. 20,147; Steven M. Koehler, Reg. No. 36,188; David D. Brush, Reg. No. 34,557; John D. Veldhuis-Kroeze, Reg. No. 38,354; Deirdre Megley Kvale, Reg. No. 35,612; Theodore M. Magee, Reg. No. 39,758; Peter S. Dardi, Reg. No. 39,650; Christopher R. Christenson, Reg. No. 42,413; John A. Wiberg, Reg. No. 44,401; and Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885.

I ratify all prior actions taken by Westman, Champlin & Kelly, P.A. or the attorneys and agents mentioned above in connection with the prosecution of the above-mentioned patent application.

DESIGNATION OF CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

Please address all correspondence and telephone calls to Joseph R. Kelly in care of:

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

Inventor: _____ Date: _____
(Signature)

Inventor: Robert C. Moore
(Printed Name)

Residence: _____ Citizenship: _____

P.O. Address: _____